

New York Tribune

MONDAY, DECEMBER 23, 1912.

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Company, a New York corporation; Editor, M. J. Kelly; President, Conde Hamilton; Secretary, James M. Barrett; Treasurer, Address, Tribune Building, No. 154 Nassau street, New York.

Subscription Rates:—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York.
Daily and Sunday, one month, \$4.75
Daily and Sunday, one year, \$45.00
Daily only, one month, \$3.00
Daily only, one year, \$27.00
Sunday only, one month, \$1.25
Sunday only, one year, \$12.50

Foreign subscriptions to all countries in the Universal Postal Union, including postage.
Daily and Sunday, one month, \$11.50
Daily and Sunday, one year, \$115.00
Sunday only, one month, \$4.50
Sunday only, one year, \$45.00

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Matter.
Our readers will confer a favor by advising us when they are unable to procure a copy of The Tribune from their newsdealer.
Address: Tribune, Circulation Department.

DEPENDING ON A SYSTEM.

In a public school on the outskirts of this city, where air should be as pure and as plentiful as in the country, two boys, sturdy lads twelve or fourteen years old, fainted one day last week, being overcome by foul air. This was in "assembly," at about 9:20 in the morning, when the schoolrooms not having been used for many hours, the air should have been pure if at any time during the day. Two teachers helped the boys out of the room. They and other teachers remarked upon the foulness of the air in the classrooms that day, but none of them ventured to open the windows, except during the few minutes devoted to physical exercises. The school has a ventilating system, and opening windows "interferes with" its operation. So the teachers understand that they are not permitted to open the windows, no matter how badly such relief is needed. The ventilating system must always be thought of first.

The Tribune dwells on this incident because it seems to supply a vivid illustration of what is the matter with public education here in every way. Those who are in touch with the children and see their needs generally feel that they have no real freedom to use their own judgment. When they reach for a window pole to let a little of heaven's pure air not only into the lungs but into the minds of the children, their arms are paralyzed by the thought of what would happen to the system. The result is not for the ventilating of children's intellects there is a sort of intellectual ventilating system. Mental dead faints are not so obvious as physical dead faints, but there is any reason to believe that "canned" education renews the red blood of the mind any better than "canned" air renews that of the body?

Now, we do not suppose that any one having central authority intends to have the rules regarding physical ventilation, whatever they are, work the way they do. Probably those in control think that throughout the whole school room has been preserved for that degree of individual action and initiative which is necessary to vitality, while confining their operation only to such an extent as to produce that measure of uniformity which is necessary to prevent anarchy. But it is their business to see, not merely presume, that this is so in actual practice everywhere. Meanwhile it is well to bear in mind that picture of a public school teacher—the foregoing incident presents—so stripped of initiative that she doesn't open the windows when boys faint.

THE MONGOLIAN MUDDLE.

The latest news concerning Mongolia is somewhat less alarming than that of a little while ago. We were recently told that China was sending armies to Mongolia to maintain her sovereignty, while a tidal wave of hatred and defiance of Russia was sweeping over the republic. On the other hand, Russia was also sending troops to Unga and other points to prevent the assertion of Chinese authority and to sustain the Mongols in their newly proclaimed independence; and the Mongols, it was said, were determined not to submit another day to Chinese rule. But now all that sound and fury seems to have shimmered down to some expressions of objection on China's part to certain features of a so-called treaty which Russia has made with some Mongolian chieftains.

The story of the case is substantially this: There expired last year by limitation the Russo-Chinese treaty of 1881, which secured important trade rights to Russia in Mongolia. Before the plenipotentiaries who met at St. Petersburg for the purpose could negotiate a substitute the Chinese revolution occurred, and the whole matter was thrown into the melting pot. Russia thereupon insisted that until a new treaty could be made the old one should be continued in force. Before China could reply to this the Kutukhtu of Unga, in Outer Mongolia, an important Mongol prince, declared the independence of Outer Mongolia and asked for Russian recognition and support. Russia advised him to remain under Chinese suzerainty, while claiming autonomy, and on his agreeing to this Russia made a treaty with him for the preservation of her trade rights. To this China has objected, but Russia replies that it is China's own fault that the treaty was made, on account of her failure herself to make one in place of that of 1881.

That is the Russian story, which seems to be reasonably substantiated. The Chinese version is that all of Inner Mongolia and Eastern Turkestan promptly gave loyal adherence to the Chinese Republic. Chaptundampa, the Kutukhtu of Unga, with the prices of two of the four Khanates of Outer Mongolia, dissented, declared the independence of that region and sought Russian aid. They and their followers comprise less than one-tenth of Mon-

golia. All the other princes of Mongolia have repudiated Chaptundampa's action and declare that no agreement or treaty which he may have made with Russia will be recognized by them or by Mongolia as a whole. There is doubtless some disorder and danger to Russian trade interests in the disaffected region around Unga, and it is probable that some Cossacks have been sent thither from Irkutsk for their protection. Naturally, Chinese forces are advancing toward that point also. But that there is any determined plan for a clash between the two powers is to be doubted. The more natural solution of the problem would seem to be for the two governments to get together and negotiate a new treaty in place of that which expired last year and superseding the temporary arrangement which Russia has made with the Mongolian chieftains.

A NATION'S TRIBUTE.

The honors paid by the British government and people to the memory of Whitelaw Reid have been of a character so impressive and so significant of sincere respect and affection as to touch deeply not only every heart bound to him by personal ties, but also every peace-loving American citizen. "Ambassador, statesman, kinsman, more than friend, Whitelaw Reid had 'won the nation's heart,'" says "The Pall Mall Gazette," and the warm personal expressions of King and Queens and statesmen, the stately service in Westminster Abbey, the silent multitude in the streets and the solemn procession of the Natal across the Atlantic, all bear witness to the high place which he had won in the esteem of the nation.

No flatterer could be paid to any man's memory than these which so spontaneously expressed the regard of the British people. The voyage of the Natal and the honors which went before it are, moreover, the symbol of international good will, the outpouring of British friendship and sympathy for America, which all Americans will appreciate, and no one more deeply than those who felt the greatest loyalty to Whitelaw Reid, the man; for they well know how completely to his influence and honor at his post meant ability to serve his country and promote the common peace and happiness of the two great Anglo-Saxon peoples.

THE MINOR COURTS.

The decision of the Appellate Division that the Legislature exceeded its authority in passing a bill in 1911 increasing the jurisdiction of the City Court to include cases of litigation involving a value of \$5,000 instead of \$2,000 is to be welcomed. The City Court exists under the authority of the Legislature to create inferior local courts, but the constitution stipulates that local inferior courts are not to have greater jurisdiction than the county courts, which extends to cases involving values of only \$2,000 or less. There is a very clear question of public policy involved in this. It is the right of the "small litigant" to have his case heard with as much care and deliberation as that of the litigant who may have thousands or millions of dollars involved. For him "minor courts" are created—the Municipal Court, the City Court in Manhattan, the county courts. It seems to be the tendency—or at least there seems to be a desire—to take these small courts out of their place in the judicial system. A year or two ago a vigorous effort was made to legislate "dignity" into the Municipal courts by way of increased salary for the judges and increased jurisdiction as to the amount of money involved in litigation. It failed, and the Municipal Court is still "the poor man's court."

TREATIES AND LAWS.

The most significant feature of much that is being said about the alleged conflict between law and treaty in the Panama tolls matter is the suggestion of unfamiliarity with the intent of the Constitution as understood by its authors. There was no uncertainty in the minds of those eminent and authoritative men as to the relationship between treaties and laws, the differences in the methods of making and unmaking them and the reasons for joining the Senate with the President as a part of the treaty-making power.

It was pointed out by Hamilton that the making of treaties was neither an executive nor a legislative act, and thus did not pertain exclusively to either of those departments of government. Its object was the making of contracts with other nations, which should have the force of law though they were not laws in the ordinary sense. That is, they were not rules prescribed by the sovereign to the subject, but agreements between sovereign and sovereign, deriving their force from the obligations of good faith. And while in other countries the power of making treaties was exercised by the crown alone, under our system of representative popular sovereignty it was eminently desirable for this power to be shared by at least a part of the national legislature.

Jay went further and more to the point. He answered the demand that treaties, if they were to have the force of law, should be made and unmade in the same manner as laws, with the reminder that the judgments of state courts and commissions of Governors were as valid and binding as acts of the legislature; that all constitutional acts of power had such validity, by whomsoever performed, and that the people were certainly competent to commit the treaty-making power to a special body which was distinct from the executive, the legislative and the judicial. That treaties, like acts of the legislature, should be repealable at the pleasure of this country was inadmissible, because a treaty was a bargain or contract between two sovereign nations and should enjoy the inviolability of contracts. It would be impossible for us to find a nation willing to make a treaty with us which should be absolutely binding upon it, but upon us only so long and so far as we pleased. Of course, he added, treaties, like laws, might be altered or repealed at the pleasure of their makers, but the radical difference between them was that laws were made by a single government for the regulation of its subjects or

citizens, while a treaty was made equally by two sovereign governments and could therefore be altered or repealed only by concurrent action of both.

One other point which Jay made seems especially pertinent to present consideration. Affairs of trade and navigation, he urged, with which treaties have much to do, should be regulated by a system cautiously formed and steadily pursued, with which both our treaties and our laws should correspond, and the maintenance of this correspondence and conformity was, he declared, "well provided for by making 'concurrence of the Senate necessary' 'both to treaties and to laws.' The reference of all treaties to the Senate for ratification was thus, in his view, intended partly as a means of guarding against any conflict between laws and treaties, it being reasonably assumed that the Senate, as a part of the law-making and also of the treaty-making power, would not permit the enactment of a law which violated a treaty which it had already ratified and would not ratify a treaty in violation of a law which it had already enacted. That is a view of Senatorial functions which might profitably be commended to present consideration.

NOT A GOOD MODEL.

The "State Athletic Commission," which administers the Frawley prizefight law, announces that it is such an admirable statute that citizens of other states are deluging the offices of the commission with inquiries about it, preparatory to making it a model for legislation in their commonwealths. Any state that thinks of having a law similar to this enacted should hear both sides of the story before it goes ahead on the theory that New York is satisfied. It should know that the Governor who signed the law recommended its repeal in vigorous terms when he saw the conditions it produced. The Commissioner best known in the amateur athletic world resigned early in the law's career because of scandalous prizefights and a disgraceful snarl in which the commission and a fight club were entangled. The commission at the present time is raising the level of amateur sport and encouraging lovers of boxing by penalizing boxers who bite their opponents' ears, but otherwise even prizefighting is so uninteresting that its followers are venting daily protests about "punks" and "fakes."

New York State has often set the pace in legislation. Its public service commissions law was the inspiration and the model for the New Jersey law, while the California law embodied much of the text of our statute. New York's insurance reform legislation was widely copied. Its good roads measures have been studied. Even its example in abolishing or seeking to abolish professional racketeering gambling was followed by other states. New York has been proud of this record, even though these laws have not met universal approval here. The state is not proud of the prizefight law, and no state with wholesome self-respect will adopt that measure.

MONEY AND BUSINESS.

Current events influential on the business of the New York Stock Exchange were many last week. On Monday the Supreme Court handed down its decision in the Anthracite Coal case, which was favorably received by the New York stock market and caused an upward turn in the trend of prices. In the following days of the week other important occurrences were the summoning of J. Pierpont Morgan to Washington to testify before the Pujo committee, the announced agreement between Austria and Serbia, which apparently removed the possibility of war between those countries; the increase in the dividend rate by the Reading road, the appearance of the extremely favorable foreign trade statement of the United States for November, and the improvement in the tone of the foreign stock markets. In addition to these salient features of the week's news there were announced increases in dividends by various corporations and favorable earnings statements by railroads and industrial concerns. Aside from the decision of the Supreme Court, probably Mr. Morgan's testimony before the investigating committee at Washington was the most important factor in the New York stock market. Not only was his testimony interpreted as offering relief to the strain occasioned by the attacks on the Stock Exchange, but the manner in which Mr. Morgan answered the questions put to him reassured Wall Street, and assisted materially to improve the tone of the market in the latter days of the week. It may be argued that the adverse factors have been removed from the investment field, but the gradual process of elimination has reduced their number and assisted to a degree in clearing the atmosphere of much apprehension, which for several weeks past has held business in securities under subjection.

Business in the regular commercial lines gave a good account of itself, according to the reports of commercial agencies and the various trade publications covering the important industrial interests. The reported demand for rails from railroad transportation companies was particularly impressive, one system alone is said to have closed a contract for 200,000 tons of rails for next year. Purchase of cars during the week were large, and the market strength of steel was shown in the advance of prices for materials. It is said that an increase in the price of pig iron is indicated, and that there is a scarcity of crude steel.

The drygoods market is seasonably quiet, but prices continue firm, and the retail trade is said to be better this year than it was a year ago. Dulness prevailed in footwear as usual prior to the holidays, but producers are said to have a good volume of contracts on hand. Hides have shown a tendency to lower prices.

The local money situation improved considerably during the week. Call money remained easy, and some time loans were made without suggesting any hardening of rates. Western bankers are reported to have purchased for the regulation of its subjects or

situation displayed some improvement. In a way, the suggestive tone of improvement is somewhat superficial, as the demand for money will increase rather than decrease, while the supply may not keep up with the requirements. In the foreign money market there was rather an easier tendency. The most conspicuous evidence of this was the weekly statement of the Imperial Bank of Germany, which showed an increase of both gold and silver holdings. Another favorable indication was the fact that none of the official banks of Europe changed its discount rate. The money and business outlook, as a whole, is better than it was a week ago.

Governor Tener of Pennsylvania will fight Flinn. It cannot be that he mistakes the Pittsburgh reformer for a boss?

Justice Steiner, of the Court of Special Sessions, is reported to have said that if he could have his way the penalty for a drunken chauffeur's reckless driving of an automobile would be not less than five years in prison. That was more *obiter dictum*, but there are lots of people who would like to see it made the effective judgment of the court.

If the speakers at the New York University Forum don't look out some disciple of Epictetus will tell them that their heads are stuffed with vice and crime.

The suggestion of the use of automatic stokers on locomotives has much to commend it. On a number of roads the system has been tried with gratifying results. It means less expense for labor, economy of fuel and a perceptible abatement of the smoke nuisance when soft coal is used. If those results can be generally attained the argument for the change is strong.

"Vasquez drops politics" is the latest word from Santo Domingo. But will he let it stay dropped?

Prince Alexander of Serbia seems to have been emulating the famous youth "who bore 'mid snow and ice a banner with the strange device, Excellence!" but with more fortunate results than those achieved by his adventurous prototype. But the pious monks of St. Bernard got in their fine work, all the same.

It is all very well for Manhattanese to scoff at Staten Island for having "one of the most antique and inefficient 'electric' railroads in the city," but it takes Manhattan itself to have the only authentic relics of the hobnail horse car era, not merely antique but positively archaic.

Now it is the keepers of vicious records who are trying to "embarrass" Mayor Gaynor. How ungrateful, after his winking at anything that did not offend "outward order and decency!"

If it is true that the city cannot compel reckless automobile drivers or drivers of any vehicles to pay for the damage which they do to trees, fences, bridges and other things along the streets and in the parks, then it must be said that there is urgent need of an ordinance giving the city the requisite power.

THE TALK OF THE DAY.

Within the last twenty years, in spite of the spread of prohibition in this country, the consumption of beer has increased more than twice as fast as the population. Persons coming from the countries of Southern Europe, where wine is the drink of the people, soon learn to like beer and accept it readily as a substitute for the wines to which they have been accustomed. In spite of the rapid growth of its consumption, beer is by no means a new beverage. Chaucer sang its merits more than four hundred years ago, when he extolled the sturdy miller, who "brought of mighty ale a large quart." Shakespeare, too, was familiar with it, for he affirms that Henry V. would have given "all his fame for a pot of ale." Milton also testified to the tonic effects of "the spicy, nut-brown ale," and in the "Leather Bottle," an old English ballad, a health is offered to "all brave Englishmen who love their cup of ale." At Rameleigh's, in the days of Steele, the treasures of old English cheer were freely sung about, chief among them being "stout English beer."

"Did you come out well on Christmas morning, Willie?"

"Yes, sir. I got more things than any of my brothers or sisters."

"Indeed! How did that come about?"

"I got up two hours before they did!"

A SLIM CHRISTMAS STOCKING.
Say, Muggie, turn your lamps on me. Ain't I the dandy lad?

For Santa Claus to tackle when? He comes to make us glad?

Say, see this cap on top my block. And will you mind the coat I wears to match it? Won't these rag Gt Uncle Santa's goat?

A few days ago enjoying cigarettes and the latest editions of the exploits of the Far West "heroes" and girded with imitation weapons, which had been cut out of wood. The laughter of the youngsters had betrayed them. The attendant routed them out and found several much handled copies of the stories that are wont to inflame the youthful mind with false hopes of greatness.

"Our sins are sure to find us out," quoted the Wise Guy.

"Yes, but they have an unpleasant habit of calling again," added the Simple Man.—Philadelphia Record.

"There is the material for a film picture," writes a Berlin correspondent to "The Vienna Post," and tells of the suicide of Wilhelm Wolff, the leader of a company of professional singers. "The company of professional singers," a postcard, on which was written: "The competition of the moving picture business has ruined me. I had engagements until yesterday and could pay my debts, but now I am out of work and see no prospect of securing any. I have composed over four hundred humorous song sketches, and now comes the tragedy. My poor wife and child. A pistol shot—found dead—curtain."

Son—Say, mother, father broke this vase before he sent you to bed.
Mother—My beautiful majolica vase!
Wait till he comes back, that's all.
Son—May I stay up till he does?
Elegiac Blather.

BOLTON BROWN REPLIES.

Analyzes "H. S. B.'s" Letter Dealing with Linguistic Changes.

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: I have just read "H. S. B.'s" letter in your columns in rebuttal of my previously expressed position that since linguistic changes were normal it was unwise to worry about them. "H. S. B.'s" letter raises more questions than can be discussed here; but if The Tribune thinks the discussion worth the space I might reply to one or two.

Yes, I do argue that if a German or a Frenchman works his vocal machinery harder than an American then the inevitable action of the laws of nervous compression tax him for it either in the quality or the quantity of his thought per unit of time. In asking this question "H. S. B." ignores the time element, which he shouldn't.

My critic speaks of my "desire for economy." Of course, I neither have nor have I expressed any "desire" at all. What I point to is a psychological law, the existence of which every student of modern psychology accepts.

Again, your correspondent inquires of me whether we should "imitate the speech of the ignorant rather than that of the educated." Again I point out that as to the "educated" man, in the eye of science "there ain't no such animal." The so-called "educated" man whom "H. S. B." has in mind is obviously the booky man. It is but rarely, however, that this minute minority of any population has cut much ice in making language or in making anything else. The fluid, living, unconscious speech of an active human—this, the greatest of literary men—Dante, Chaucer and Shakespeare—have gladly accepted.

Language is not a fossil. It is not even dead. Living, it grows; growing, it changes. It is created by and for the mental and emotional needs of countless millions of average men, "ignorant" men. They wrote not, neither did they read. They spoke, they hear. Hence comes human language.

One more point: Laziness. Average man gets thus and so. This is a scientific fact. You choose to call this laziness, thus implying a moral condemnation. But how can one be condemned morally for doing things in the most economical way—in short, for being, albeit unconsciously, intelligent? It is impossible. The question has absolutely nothing to do with morals, but solely with psychology.

True, there is a question of convention, and it is the sense of convention, of accepted social usage, that is displaced by certain things. But there is no space here to go into that. BOLTON BROWN.
New York, Dec. 19, 1912.

"UNEQUAL BEFORE THE LAW"

Punishment for Men and Women Not Justly Applied.

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: About ten days ago there appeared in your paper a communication signed "Miriam Strong" under the heading "Unequal Before the Law." In which it was pointed out that it is difficult to convict men who are guilty of crimes against women. Permit me to ask why it is that men who have been indicted for criminal assault and who have been convicted by trial or confession are given inadequate sentences? Is this the fault of the law, or is it the fault of the judges who interpret the law?

In a recent case a man who had been indicted for a grave crime against a young woman was not only permitted, but was urged, by the court to plead guilty to assault in the second degree and was sent to the Elmira Reformatory for a short term.

Every week in this city men guilty of crimes against girls and women are given a ridiculously mild sentence considering the infamy of the crimes and the fact that their victims are ruined for life, on the plea that it is a "first offense" (first conviction probably). One year in the city prison for criminally assaulting a girl is not sufficient to deter brutes of this type. Why do judges hold so cheap a woman's virtue?

Quite recently (this was in New Jersey) a man of fifty-four was sentenced to only four and a half years for assaulting a ten-year-old girl!

The law, as interpreted in our courts, discriminates against women and often shields men—even protects them in their vices. The penalty for working the "badger" game is heavy, in spite of the fact that the crime is usually instigated by the woman's male confederate. I recall a case in which a woman was sent to state prison for seven years for this offense. Compare this with a sentence of one year for ruining a girl, body and soul, for life. I ask you, is it fair, is it just?

Only the other day a woman was sentenced to not less than two and not more than three and a half years for perjury. She was trying to separate a man from his money—a terrible crime. Within the last few months a man was sent to the city prison for three months for perjury—he swore falsely in court in regard to a character of a girl who had brought a very serious charge against another man. I am told by a lawyer that a certain type of men think nothing of doing this and that it is a common practice—another instance of men's loyalty to one another. Evidently the judge thought it a not very grave offense, for he gave the man only three months. Compare this with the woman's long sentence. Is it fair, is it just?

Take the social evil. A man and a woman transgress the moral law. Both are equally guilty, but it is the woman

offender who is punished by the law, hounded from place to place and blackmailed by the police and men vultures. The male offender gets off scot free and goes on his way rejoicing. Is this fair, is this just?

AND JUSTICE WEEPS.
New York, Dec. 21, 1912.

THE FATE OF VIVISECTION

Will Be Decided by Public Opinion, Writes a Correspondent.

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: In the belief that the daily press is maintained for the benefit of the people at large, and not in the interest of any faction, and knowing that the truth of a disputed question can be reached only by the fair presentation of both sides, an anti-vivisectionist asks space to call attention to the usual methods of vivisectionists when dealing with anti-vivisection. Did space allow, the writer would take up in detail the claims and charges made by Dr. Keen in his lengthy article in The Tribune of December 8. As it is, however, this letter must content itself with challenging his charge of cruelty against the great humane movement of the day. The great mass of anti-vivisectionists must, indeed, deplore the cruel wish expressed by Dr. Keen's correspondent, which he cites as a proof of the baneful "influence of anti-vivisection upon character." No fair-minded person would condemn a whole body for the utterances of a few individuals, nor would a thoughtful person be convinced of the mercifulness of vivisection by the picture of the dancing dog which illustrates Dr. Keen's article and is offered supposedly as a proof of the exhilarating effect of vivisection on dogs.

Vivisection to-day is on trial before the world, and in the eagerness of its defense its advocates seize upon any expedient to try to bring discredit upon its opponents. The first dictum was that the foes of vivisection were well meaning but foolish sentimentalists, mostly women, who cared more for a mouse than for a human being. But when it became known that Dr. Samuel Johnson, Bismarck, Victor Hugo, Tolstoy, Carlyle and Voltaire were anti-vivisectionists it became necessary to modify this opinion. Anti-vivisectionists were next pronounced to be untrained to judge of the value of animal experimentation by reason of their ignorance of the practice, of their being unscientific, and, in fact, were declared to be "obstructionists in the path of progress." In reply to this charge we point to the words of some of the most eminent members of the medical profession, whose intimate knowledge of the practice gives them the right to speak with authority when they pronounce vivisection "cruel," "useless," "misleading" and "demoralizing to the characters of those who practise it."

Eventually the fate of vivisection will be decided by public opinion, that great power which overturns thrones and systems, and, indeed, rules the world. Pending this decision anti-vivisectionists will continue the fight for what they believe to be for the uplift of the world, physical as well as moral, having in mind the struggles and final triumphs of reformers in the past and encouraged by the wave of humanity which is spreading over the world of to-day.

ANTI-VIVISECTIONIST.

Baltimore, Dec. 17, 1912.

SPECIALIZING THE NURSE

Why Subject Nervous Patients to Nurses Temperamentally Unfit?

To the Editor of The Tribune.
Sir: Will you permit me through the columns of your paper to call the attention of the public in general and the medical profession in particular to what I consider the great need of a change in the training of nurses in all the training schools. The present system seems to me entirely to the disadvantage of the vast army of sick people and of nurses. Among the countless numbers of women who graduate yearly from the training schools a large percentage are unfitted through temperament and character for the work which they undertake and which is put upon them.

In these days when physicians are constantly specializing in their work, after graduating from the courses of study in the colleges and hospitals, why could there not be such a system established in the training of nurses? For example, the system could be arranged under five general departments of work, viz: Surgery, obstetrics, fevers, etc., tuberculosis and nervous diseases. Each department could have its shades of training after the course of general training was finished.

If nurses, in accordance with their own inclinations and also through the judgment and advice of those who are in authority over them during their training, were appointed under each one of the above mentioned departments and centered their efforts on that branch of the work which appealed to them most, how much mental suffering would be spared the poor nervous patients especially, to whom are given nurse after nurse just because she happens to be free at the time, regardless of her fitness or unfitness.

A person would never think of calling in a surgeon to attend a case of typhoid fever; neither would one consult an oculist for tuberculosis. As nursing at the present day is such an important factor in the treatment of disease, why have a system which permits a nurse who has been trained for surgical cases to be called in on nervous cases, failing utterly in the latter when she might be a perfect success in the former?

The change I suggest would, it seems to me, give each nurse a chance to perfect herself in her chosen line of work, and certainly would bring about, if not much speedier recoveries, great peace of mind to her patients in countless instances.

H. S.
New York, Dec. 12, 1912.

THE MAYOR AND THE POLICE.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: After reading your editorial in today's Tribune, "How Will It End?" the writer hereof is astonished that any one can put any stock in the charges made against the police in the last few days about graft. Have we not too read word for word, over and over again, that he has stopped the graft in the Police Department?

The only funny thing about it is, since he has taken office and stopped graft, it is worse than it ever was, and it only took him three years to accomplish it. It is safe to say, if he could be Mayor another three years there would not be an honest policeman left.

J. M.
New York, Dec. 19, 1912.

MICHIGAN ANTI BY 760 VOTES.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Did the official count, 10th inst., bring out Michigan for or against woman suffrage, and by what majority?

HARLES WARD.
Middlesex, N. J., Dec. 20, 1912.

ROYAL DUKE FOR ERIN

Viceroyalty of Ireland No Longer a Party Office.

(Copyright, 1912, by the Brewster Company.) Ireland's viceroyalty is to undergo a radical transformation. However much the Unionists may differ with the Asquith administration about other Irish matters they are agreed upon this point.

Hitherto the Viceroy has always been a conspicuous member of the political party in power and has retired from office with the fall of the Cabinet. Henceforth the viceroyalty is to be non-partisan.

The Lord Lieutenant is to have a term of office for six years, wholly independent of the tenure of office of the imperial administration, is to remain wholly aloof from party politics and is to be on precisely the same footing as the Governor General of Canada, of South Africa, of Australia and of the Dominions of New Zealand. In the bill drawn up for the reorganization of the viceroyalty, and to which Liberals and Unionists are agreed, it is expressly stated that "the Lord Lieutenant shall in the discharge of the duties of his office conform to the accustomed practice of the governors of his majesty's overseas dominions."

This is destined to pave the way for the appointment of a prince of the blood to the viceroyalty of Ireland, and it is quite possible that when the Duke of Connaught leaves Canada he may become the first royal Lord Lieutenant in modern times to hold court for the King in Dublin Castle.

The royal family have always been popular in Ireland since the days when George IV held such festive court in Dublin, his good temper there being brought to the brim by over stage by the to him so welcome news of the death of his wife, Queen Caroline, whom he abhorred. The Irish people have always endeavored to show—particularly the inhabitants of Dublin—that they have no quarrel with the members of the reigning house and that whatever bitterness there has been in Erin in connection with British rule has been directed against the government rather than against the throne. King George and Queen Mary, both prior and monarchs of their country, have always been welcomed with the most unbounded cordiality and enthusiasm whenever they have visited Ireland, and throughout the years that the Duke of Connaught spent in Dublin as commander in chief of the military forces of the Emerald Isle, neither he nor his wife and daughters ever received an unfriendly word or an unfriendly look; nothing, indeed, but kindness from the Irish people.

Appreciating this, Queen Victoria, King Edward and now King George have always hitherto turned a deaf ear to the suggestion that any member of their family should hold court in their name as Lord Lieutenant at Dublin Castle as long as the viceroyalty remained a political party office. The sovereign, as a constitutional ruler, is often forced to give way to the wishes of Parliament and to those of the administration for the time being, and to sanction things repugnant to the occupant of the throne. But the monarch has not been able to see any advantage to be derived in identifying himself or the royal family more than absolutely necessary with acts of policy that are sometimes dictated more by a partisan spirit than by a sense of justice or public interest.

The popularity of the royal family in Ireland would have suffered grievously had a prince of the blood been obliged as a partisan Viceroy to assume the odium of the distasteful measures devised by a Liberal or a Unionist Cabinet in Downing Street, and to identify himself with its views. But when the viceroyalty ceases to be a partisan office and its occupant is required to hold aloof from party politics there will be no more objection to its being held by a royal prince than there was to the appointment of the Duke of Connaught as commander in chief in Ireland.

A Very Ancient Office.

The Viceroyalty of Ireland is a very ancient office, which dates from the reign of Henry II, the first of its incumbents being Hugh de Lacy, in 1172. There have been several occasions, especially during the latter half of the nineteenth century, when it has been proposed to abolish it, but this has always been opposed by the Nationalists, who regarded the maintenance of a separate court at Dublin as emphasizing their separate existence from Great Britain.

Since Ireland has always been more or less ruled from the banks of the Thames, even in the days prior to the Union, when there was an Irish Parliament in Dublin, the Lord Lieutenant has had relatively little real power. The latter has been vested almost wholly in the hands of his principal secretary, who, occupying a seat in the Cabinet, has been virtual master of the island and minister for Ireland. The result of this anomaly